

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
AT TACOMA

KEITH L. NASH,

Plaintiff,

v.

DOUG WADDINGTON, *et al.*,

Defendants.

Case No. C06-5127 RJB/KLS

ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFF'S
MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION
AND SECOND MOTION TO
EXCEED WRITTEN
INTERROGATORY LIMIT

This 42 U.S.C. § 1983 civil rights action has been referred to United States Magistrate Judge Karen L. Strombom pursuant to Title 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) and Local MJR 3 and 4. Presently before the Court are Plaintiff's motion to reconsider the Court's denial of his request to exceed the written interrogatory limit (Dkt. # 98) and second motion to exceed the written interrogatory limit (Dkt. # 99). Having carefully reviewed Plaintiff's motions and Defendants' opposition (Dkt. # 100, 101), the Court finds that Plaintiff's motions should be denied.

DISCUSSION

On February 28, 2007, the Court extended the discovery cut-off date from February 2, 2007 until May 1, 2007. (Dkt. # 93). However, the extension was solely to allow the parties to complete deposition discovery. (*Id.* at 2). The Court denied Plaintiff's request to exceed the written

1 interrogatory limit of 25. (*Id.* at 3). The Court noted that Plaintiff had not explained what
2 information he needed from the Defendants that would require interrogatories in excess of those
3 allowed under the Rules and that he could not obtain through the various depositions of the
4 Defendants. (*Id.* at 2-3).

5 Motions for reconsideration are disfavored and will ordinarily be denied in the “absence of a
6 showing of manifest error in the prior ruling or a showing of new facts or legal authority which could
7 not have been brought to the court’s attention earlier with reasonable diligence.” Local Rule CR
8 7(h)(1).

9 Plaintiff has identified no error in the Court’s order, nor presented any new facts or legal
10 authority that suggest reconsideration is appropriate. Plaintiff complains only that the Court did not
11 consider his response, which was not timely filed. (Dkt. # 93 n. 1). However, Plaintiff still has not
12 explained to the Court what information he is seeking from Defendants and why he cannot obtain
13 that information through the depositions that are being scheduled and for which the Court has given
14 him an ample extension of time.

15 Accordingly, Plaintiff’s motion for reconsideration (Dkt. # 98) and motion to exceed the
16 written interrogatory limit (Dkt. # 99) are **DENIED**.

17
18 DATED this 17th day of April, 2007.

19
20
21 
22 Karen L. Strombom
23 United States Magistrate Judge
24
25
26